

August 16, 2016

RECEIVED
OREGON OPERATIONS OFFICE

5010

SEP 01 2016

EPA-REGION 10

U.S. EPA
ATTN: Harbor Comments
805 SW Broadway, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97205

As a retired civil engineer, I would oppose a plan that does more harm than good to our rivers, especially when it is a costly approach. What happens when they're done and the problem is worse? The follow up will cost even more, putting us well above the \$1bn estimate. If there are highly concentrated areas of contaminated materials, it makes sense to tackle one area and see how it goes. Evaluate those results and see if there are better approaches to really solve the problem. Perhaps single out the worst spot in the river, not an entire 10-mile stretch all at once. Use the isolated area as a pilot cleanup project. This is a more flexible approach that addresses the realities and doesn't extend the problem.

Spending a billion dollars upfront only to find out the plan doesn't work is a waste. Doing this means we will have to spend more than the original billion when something else goes wrong. Based on current data, the river is healing itself, burying the contaminants. That doesn't mean the river doesn't need some help, but we need to find an option that works with the river in its current state. Dredging up the river will only make the problem worse again.

I'd like to see the EPA use the best available science, and spend the least amount of money, to deal with the potential problems caused by hazardous pollutants in the river. Bringing those substances to the surface does not sound like the best solution.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)



(b) (6)



Portland • OR • 97236